

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 18-20 were presented for examination, with claims 9-17 having been previously withdrawn. The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 5-7 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by United States Patent No. 4,690,235 to Miyakoshi ("Miyakoshi"). Claims 2-4, and claim 8 are rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyakoshi in view of Hebert. Applicant hereby cancels claim 6 and amends claim 1. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added thereby.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 5-7 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 5-7 as anticipated by Miyakoshi. Miyakoshi discloses a motor vehicle having a steering handle, a front wheel disposed in front of the steering handle and steerable by the steering handle, a rear wheel disposed behind the rider's seat, an engine for driving at least the rear wheels, and a side runner. The front and rear wheels are held in substantial alignment with each other along an axis. In one embodiment, a snow plow can be assembled by changing the plow attachment on the motor vehicle's front end.

Miyakoshi does not disclose an agricultural system comprising a motorcycle drive unit and a tool assembly wherein the motorcycle drive unit is adapted for removable attachment to the tool assembly, the tool assembly further comprising a braking system wherein the agricultural system is capable of farming. In contrast, Miyakoshi is silent with respect to, and therefore does not disclose a braking system that is coupled to the tool assembly. In contrast, the snowplow unit 460 includes an auger, and a shaft 462 with a gear box 464 operatively coupled on its intermediate portion.

Since Miyakoshi does not disclose every element of the claimed invention, Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended is patentable over Miyakoshi. Applicant also submits that claims 5, 7, and 18-20 are also patentable for all the reasons for which claim 1 is patentable because these claims depend, directly or indirectly, from a patentable base claim.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Rejection of Claims 2-4, and 8 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2-4 and claim 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyakoshi in view of Hebert. Hebert discloses a vehicle for pulling farm implements and the like, and which may also be used as a transportation vehicle. In one embodiment, as illustrated in FIG. 1, Hebert discloses a tractor pulling a walking plow 40. The walking plow 40 has a plow beam 41 being connected by a clevis device 42 with a draw bar 13. The draw bar 13 is secured to two parallel side members 10 and 11 by bolts 14, the side members 10, 11 comprising part of the frame A of the tractor. The device may have a single rear wheel B1 or may be changed to a double rear wheel arrangement.

Hebert is silent with respect to, and therefore does not disclose a motorcycle drive unit wherein the motorcycle drive unit is adapted for removable attachment to a tool assembly, the tool assembly comprising a structural chassis and an axle having first and second ends with a first wheel disposed at the first end of the axle and a second wheel disposed at the second end of the axle, a transmission unit including a differential gear box disposed between the first and second wheels, a multi-purpose tool bar for at least one of a cultivator, a seed drill, and a sprayer kit mounted on said structural chassis; a braking system connected to at least one of the first or second wheels and a lifting mechanism.

In contrast, the device of Hebert is silent with respect to, and therefore does not disclose a braking system connected to at least one of the first or second wheels. Moreover, since Miyakoshi does not disclose a braking system connected to at least one of the first or second wheels, where the wheels are connected to the tool assembly, neither reference alone or when combined teaches the claimed invention. Applicant therefore submits that claim 8 is patentable.

Applicant also submits that claims 2-4 are patentable for all the reasons for which amended claim 1 is patentable, since claims 2-4 depend directly or indirectly from the patentable base claim.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the application and claims in light of the foregoing Amendment and Response, and respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance. If, in the Examiner's opinion, a telephonic interview would expedite the favorable prosecution of the present application, the undersigned attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss any outstanding issues, and to work with the Examiner toward placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 21, 2003
Reg. No. 35,722

Tel. No.: (617) 248-7738
Fax No.: (617) 248-7100



Thomas A. Turano
Attorney for Applicant
Testa, Hurwitz, & Thibeault, LLP
High Street Tower
125 High Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

2654393

BEST AVAILABLE COPY